



1-13-03

4/11/01 3628

Patent
Docket No. PLX-001-1P US
2245447004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Nir Kossovsky, Bear Brandegee, Alexander K. Arrow
Assignee: PLX Systems, Inc.
Filing Date: May 26, 2000
Serial No.: 09/580,005
Title: **ONLINE PATENT AND LICENSE EXCHANGE**

Examiner: T. Bui
Group Art Unit: 3628

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2003

GROUP 3600

Box Non Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE & FEE TRANSMITTAL

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed on October 9, 2002, enclosed herewith for filing are the following:

- ☒ Response to Office Action [3] page(s)
- ☒ Return Postcard
- ☒ Conditional Petition for Extension of Time: An extension of time is requested to provide for timely filing if an extension of time is still required after all papers filed with this communication have been considered.
- ☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2518, Docket No. 2245447004. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

DATE: January 8, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

William A. English
Reg. No. 42,515

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, 18th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 393-2000
Telefax: (415) 393-2286

Express Mail Label No.:
EV 154 656 490 US



16 w
10-27-03
Patent

Docket No. PLX-001-1P US
2245447004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Nir Kossovsky, Bear Brandegge, Alexander K. Arrow
Assignee: PLX Systems, Inc.
Filing Date: May 26, 2000 Examiner: T. Bui
Serial No.: 09/580,005 Group Art Unit: 3628
Title: **ONLINE PATENT AND LICENSE EXCHANGE**

Box Non Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2003

GROUP 3600

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Dear Sir/Madam:

This response is filed in response to the Office Action mailed October 9, 2002.

REMARKS:

In the Office Action mailed October 9, 2002, claims 1-11, 17-24, 33-40, 49-51, and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,321,205 ("the Eder reference"), and claims 25-27, 41-43, 52, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Eder reference in view of an article by Kossovsky et al. ("the Kossovsky et al. reference"). Because neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of the present claims, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Turning first to the Eder reference, a system and method are disclosed for evaluating the impact of changes in business value drivers on other value drivers, the financial performance, and the future value of a commercial enterprise. (Col. 1, lines 18-22). The disclosed system is intended to extract, aggregate, and store transaction data and user input required to complete a valuation. (Col. 8, lines 3-6). The Eder reference discloses several variables that are stored in the database, none of which includes a technology classification nor information about publicly traded securities. (Col. 2, lines 26-60).

The Eder reference briefly mentions that an external database may be used in the valuation (col. 12, lines 1-3), but merely discloses retrieving information from the internet to enable valuation